



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/737,370	12/16/2003	Jean-Hua Yuen	N1085-00250	5375
8933	7590	01/24/2005	TSMC2003-082	
DUANE MORRIS, LLP IP DEPARTMENT ONE LIBERTY PLACE PHILADELPHIA, PA 19103-7396			EXAMINER DOUGHERTY, ANTHONY T	
			ART UNIT 2863	PAPER NUMBER

DATE MAILED: 01/24/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

SM

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/737,370	Applicant(s) YUEN ET AL.	
	Examiner Anthony T. Dougherty	Art Unit 2863	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 November 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 15-20 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5 and 7-11 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 6 and 12-14 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 17 May 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-5 and 7-11 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 4,752,898 to Koenig in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,529,932 To Doueihy et al.

With regard to claims 1 and 7 the primary reference to Koenig discloses apparatus for detecting wafer flat shift (see abstract), with a plurality of sensors in a power supply circuit for shutting off wafer fabrication equipment (see column 3 line 18-40), with optical beam sensors (see column 3 line 36-60), the sensor detecting a shift in wafer flat position (see column 3 line 61-64), and the power supply circuit shutting off the wafer fabrication equipment when the shift exceeds a set amount (see column 3 line 18-31). However, Koenig fails to disclose a relay circuit for operating a solenoid.

The secondary reference to Doueihy discloses a relay circuit for operating a solenoid (see column 3 line 23-32).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have specified the physical actuating means to shut off a power supply of Koenig by a relay operating a solenoid.

Accordingly, such a modification would have been obvious since Doueihy et al. teaches a sufficient actuating mechanism for shutting down a source of power is a relay operating a solenoid (even though this is physically shutting down fuel supply as opposed to disconnecting electrical contacts the difference in use of a solenoid controlled by a relay is readily apparent and obvious to anyone of ordinary skill in circuits and the electronic design art) (see Doueihy et al. column 3 line 23-32), thereby suggesting the obviousness of the modification.

With regard to claims 2 and 8, and applying the rejection of claims 1 and 7 above, the primary reference to Koenig discloses the sensors adjusted to detect a wafer flat shift in a plurality of directions of angular displacement (see column 3 line 64 through column 4 line 34).

With regard to claims 3 and 10, and applying the rejection of claims 1 and 7 above, the primary reference to Koenig discloses the sensors adjusted to detect a wafer flat shift in a range of (2)(0.9°) to (5)(0.9°) angular displacement (see column 4 line 23-32).

With regard to claim 4, and applying the rejection of claim 1 above, the primary reference to Koenig discloses a frame (see Figure 1), and an adjustable mounting mechanism mounting each sensor on the frame for adjustment along orthogonal axes (see column 3 line 36-60).

With regard to claim 5, and applying the rejection of claim 1 above, the primary reference to Koenig discloses a frame (see Figure 1), and sensors being adjustably mounted on the frame (see column 3 line 36-60).

With regard to claim 9, and applying the rejection of claim 7 above, the primary reference to Koenig discloses detecting the wafer flat shift by optical beam sensors (see column 3 line 36-60).

With regard to claim 11, and applying the rejection of claim 7 above, the primary reference to Koenig discloses detecting the wafer flat shift by optical beam sensors and adjusting the position of the sensors (see column 3 line 36-60).

Allowable Subject Matter

3. Claims 15-20 allowed.
4. Claims 6, and 12-14 objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.
5. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter:

The primary reason for the allowance of claims 6, 12-14, and 15-20 is the inclusion of the limitations of an apparatus for detecting a wafer flat shift which includes a relay activated by signals from sensors detecting an angular displacement of a wafer flat, a solenoid operated by the relay to open a door to release a corresponding wafer for further fabrication, and when a wafer

Art Unit: 2863

flat shift is sensed shut off the sensors which activate the door. It is these limitations found in each of the claims, as they are claimed in the combination, that has not been found, taught or suggested by the prior art of record which makes these claims allowable over the prior art.

Conclusion

6. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Art Unit: 2863


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Anthony T. Dougherty whose telephone number is (571) 272-2273. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8 to 5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John E. Barlow can be reached on (571) 272-2269. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



atd



John E. Barlow
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Technology Center 2800